

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HISTORIC CONSERVATION BOARD

MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2005

3:00 P.M., J. MARTIN GRIESEL ROOM, CENTENNIAL PLAZA II

The Historic Conservation Board met at 3:00 P.M., in the J. Martin Griesel Room, Centennial Plaza II, with members: Kirk, Kreider, Raser, Senhauser, Spraul-Schmidt, Sullebarger and Wallace present. Absent: Bloomfield and Chatterjee.

MINUTES

The Board unanimously approved the minutes of the Monday, September 12, 2005 meeting (motion by Spraul-Schmidt, second by Raser).

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 222 EAST CENTRAL PARKWAY, OVER-THE- RHINE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Staff member Adrienne Cowden presented a report on a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new entryway enclosure at the Alms & Doepke Building located at 222 E. Central Parkway.

Ms. Cowden indicated that the Hamilton County Department of Human Services renovated the building for its offices in 1995. A recessed entry was cut in the south façade with a new storefront entry and modern metal canopy. The present plan calls for extending the lobby to the exterior plane of the building and constructing a new storefront to recreate an air-lock vestibule and incorporate a handicapped entry. The new storefront would be constructed of bronze anodized aluminum installed between existing original brick and stone piers.

Ms. Cowden said that although staff would prefer a central entrance beneath the canopy, the asymmetrical scheme provides for better access and maximizes lobby space. She suggested that the storefront be built within the pier openings rather than behind that plane as proposed.

Spencer Johnson, Cole + Russell Architects, said that the storefront had been recessed a few feet so that the entry doors would not swing into the public right-of-way, but that he would be willing to make the recommended change if he could secure a revocable street privilege for the modification.

Mr. Senhauser asked if it would be possible to leave the central portion of the new vestibule at full height and treat the transoms as clerestory windows in the center space. Mr. Johnson responded that he would study enclosing only the portion of the vestibule ceiling that contained the air ducts.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger, second Spraul-Schmidt) to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new storefront on the south elevation of 222 East Central Parkway with the following conditions:

1. Center the new storefront within the existing openings between piers if a revocable street privilege can be obtained for the doors to open into the public right-of-way.
2. Eliminate the vestibule dropped ceiling where it does not enclose ductwork to preserve the appearance of the transom on the exterior.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR BRITTANY BUILDING AT 104 W. 9th STREET, NINTH STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Staff member Adrienne Cowden presented a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new storefronts on the east and south elevations and new doors for the condominium entrance on the south elevation of the six-story Brittany Building at 104 W. 9th Street. The building is being renovated currently with 15 condominium units and first floor commercial space

Ms. Cowden indicated that the existing wood paneled storefronts are not original. They will be replaced with a bronze anodized aluminum system installed between existing cast iron pilasters. Staff did discuss with the owner the possibility of installing a 12" to 18" lower panel on the new storefronts, but concluded that this would result in an awkward proportion between the display windows and transoms.

A pair of new glazed anodized aluminum doors will replace a set of wood doors at the condominium entrance on the south façade. The previous owner had indicated that the existing doors were salvaged from another building. Staff preferred that the owner retain the existing doors but recognized new doors may be required for security. Staff recommended that the new storefronts and entry doors meet the historic district guidelines.

Ms. Sullebarger said that since the storefronts were being replaced in anodized aluminum, replacing the south entry doors is acceptable in order to present a unified treatment of openings.

Mr. Raser stated that paneled storefronts are characteristic of period buildings in the district and felt the new storefronts should include a lower panel as staff had suggested.

The applicant, Jeff Jones, was present to answer questions from the Board. He assured the Board that he was not trying to give the building an inappropriate look by extending the storefront glazing to the sills, but that the lower panels presented a security and nuisance problem. He said that the panels provide a convenient backrest for those using the sill as a seat and that this had been a problem on this property and others in the area.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger, second Wallace) to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed new storefronts and doors as shown in the attached drawings and as described in the staff report.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ZONING VARIANCE FOR 2923 ANNWOOD AVENUE, EAST WALNUT HILLS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Staff Caroline Kellam presented an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness and zoning variance to demolish an existing non-contributing garage and construct a new three-car garage at 2923 Annwood Avenue. The work proposed also includes the removal of a non-original deck and the construction of a new stone patio, walkways, landscaping and driveway.

Ms. Kellam said that many properties in the East Walnut Hills Historic District feature large, detached carriage houses or garages. Recently the Board has reviewed and approved new three-car garages (attached and detached) in the district and on Annwood Avenue. In most cases zoning variances were also required.

Ms. Kellam indicated that a zoning variance is required because the garage projects a few feet into the side yard. Although the mass of the garage is in the rear yard as permitted, the Zoning Code does not permit any portion of an accessory structure in the side yard. In this instance, the

depth of the rear yard is insufficient to accommodate the garage and property line setback required under the building code. Staff recommended that the zoning variance be granted.

Ms. Kellam said that staff is concerned about the rear elevation of the garage which is highly visible from Wold Avenue. Staff believes that the blank wall proposed is inappropriate and needs to be relieved with window openings as is typical of the district. Staff also suggested that the size and scale of the coach style lights should be reduced and that the simulated hinges and handles on the garage doors be eliminated.

In response to Ms. Sullebarger, Ms. Kellam said that neighboring property owners had also voiced concern for the blank rear wall and had suggested solutions ranged from adding windows or dormers to planting and fencing. Mr. Raser pointed out that the garage roof will be more visible from Wold than the wall and agreed that a dormer(s) would help break up the silhouette.

Michael Mauch of RWA Architects stated the Lewis' had experienced several break-ins and that introducing openings in the rear wall of the garage would create security problems. He said the existing fence would sufficiently shield the garage from view from Wold Avenue, but that the owner is open to suggestions regarding the blankness of the rear wall. The Board agreed that the rear elevation of the garage needs some relief, but that this could take many different forms. The Board left it to the architect to devise an acceptable solution for approval by the Urban Conservator.

Karen Blocher of 2929 Annwood Avenue said that the new garage is a vast improvement over the present one and that her only concern is that the solution for the rear wall be at a reasonable cost so as not to discourage others from investing in the neighborhood

Applicant Stephen Lewis stated that the decorative hardware proposed for the garage doors is characteristic of historic carriage houses and helps distinguish it from a standard garage.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Spraul-Schmidt, second Sullebarger) to take the followings actions:

1. Grant a zoning variance from Section 1421-01 Accessory Residential Structures of the Zoning Code to allow the new garage to project 2.05' into the side yard finding that such relief from the literal implication of the Zoning Code will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to property in the district or vicinity where the property is located and is necessary and appropriate in the interest of historic conservation so as not to adversely affect the historic architectural or aesthetic integrity of the district.
2. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the one-story garage and deck, construction of the three-car garage, driveway, patio, walkways and landscaping at 2923 Annwood Avenue with the following conditions:
 - a. The rear (west) elevation of the garage be revised to address the blankness of the rear elevation
 - b. A smaller exterior light fixture be selected for the garage.
 - c. Final plans be reviewed and approved by the Urban Conservator prior to issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness and a building permit.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ZONING VARIANCES FOR 506
DANDRIDGE & 1318 PENDLETON STREETS, OVER-THE-RHINE HISTORIC
DISTRICT**

Staff member Caroline Kellam presented a report on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness and Zoning Variances to construct a new two-family residence at the corner of Pendleton and Dandridge Streets. This project has the same developer and architect as the Dandridge Row houses that was approved by the Board in April 2005.

Ms. Kellam said that this two-family residence will be constructed on a narrow corner lot which slopes several feet along Dandridge. As a result, the height of the unit facing Pendleton Street exceeds the 35' height limitation of the RM 1.2 Residential Multi-Family zoning district. Zoning variances are also required for front, rear and side yard setbacks in order to site the building on or near the property line as historic buildings are in the district. Likewise, the 24' wide lot is 1' narrower than required by the zoning code. Staff recommends approval of the requested variance in order to permit the new residences to be compatible with the size, scale and historic building pattern in the neighborhood.

Ms. Kellam said that staff is concerned with the larger areas of blank wall on the upper floors of the front and rear elevations above the entryways. Staff believes that either windows or reveals should be installed on the second and third floors to express the three-bay division of the façade. Staff also recommends the windows set in the brick wall on the Dandridge Street elevation be uniform on the second and third floors.

Tom Redlin of KKG Architects was present to address questions from the Board and to present modified drawings he felt would address the issues raised by staff.

Mr. Kirk stated that the proposed design has altered the rhythm/flow of the neighboring Dandridge Row project and that the disruption created by the motor court is atypical of the historic buildings in the area. Mr. Raser questioned why the foundation stepped in the middle of the building and suggested that it step at the building corner.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Kreider, second Spraul-Schmidt) to take the followings actions:

1. Grant a zoning variance from Section 1405-07 Development Regulations of the Zoning Code to allow the following variances
 - a. 0' setback on the front and 9' setback on the rear
 - b. 0'/0' for side yard setback
 - c. 24' lot width.
 - d. 37' for the building height

finding that such relief from the literal implication of the Zoning Code will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to property in the district or vicinity where the property is located and is necessary and appropriate in the interest of historic conservation so as not to adversely affect the historic architectural or aesthetic integrity of the district.

2. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new two-family residence in the Pendleton community with the following conditions:

- a. Revise the plans to establish the appearance of three bays on the front (west) and rear (east) elevations with the introduction of windows or at least a reveal of a window surround on the second and third floors to simulate the outline of windows.
- b. Revise the plans to make the second and third floor windows in the brick wall a uniform size along the south (Dandridge Street) elevation.
- c. Final plans must be reviewed and approved by the Urban Conservator prior to issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness and a building permit.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & ZONING CONSIDERATION FOR THE
CORNER OF HAMILTON AVENUE & BLUE ROCK STREET, NORTHSIDE NBD
HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Prior to the staff presentation and discussion, Tim Burke, attorney for Myron Johnson Lumber Co., asked for clarification on how testimony would be given at this hearing and whether he would have an opportunity to question those who testified. Mr. Burke was concerned that if the Board's decision was appealed, the Zoning Board of Appeals would be limited to consideration of the public record. The only opportunity to put testimony or cross-examination on the record would be at this hearing.

Mr. Senhauser confirmed that those testifying would be doing so under oath. Dotty Carman of the City's Law Department confirmed that cross-examination must be allowed. Members of the community who attended to testify expressed concern that they were without legal counsel and had not come prepared to be cross-examined by the applicant's attorney.

Mr. Senhauser said that if the staff recommendation to table the application until unresolved issues were addressed was approved by the Board, no testimony could be taken at this hearing. He suggested that the review go forward as a continuation of the preliminary design review, that testimony be given, but no formal decision made at this meeting. Mr. Burke responded that his client had made modifications to the plan based on staff suggestions and that he was prepared to go forward with a formal hearing and decision within the period proscribed by the zoning code. He acknowledged that the changes had not been available for review or comment prior to the Board meeting.

The Board took a brief recess to allow the parties to discuss the issue. Upon reconvening, Mr. Burke agreed to postpone consideration of this application until the scheduled meeting of the Board on October 24, 2005. It was further agreed that staff will re-notify and a new pre-hearing would be scheduled where the revised plan could be presented and discussed.

ADJOURN

As there were no other items for consideration by the Board, the meeting adjourned.

William L. Forwood
Urban Conservator

John C. Senhauser, Chairman

Date: _____